

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

After the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1-6 are currently pending in this application. Claims 7-15 have been canceled without prejudice. Claim 1 has been amended.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103**

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,418,782 to Wasilewski (hereinafter “Wasilewski”) in view of US Patent 6,084,643 to Kishtaka et al. (hereinafter “Kishtaka”) in further view of US Publication 2003/0137603 to Suga (hereinafter “Suga”).

Wasilewski does not individually render claim 1 obvious since Wasilewski does not teach, suggest or disclose the elements of claim 1. Wasilewski teaches virtual service selection in a multi-service communications system that includes generating a virtual service definition to specify which service components are carried on a particular frequency and periodically transmitting the virtual service definition for each basic service to the subscriber location. A decoder is located at the subscriber location that extracts from the channel one of the transmitted definitions. A unique virtual service number is then assigned to each basic service.

While Wasilewski suggests assigning a virtual service number to each basic service transmitted, it does not disclose:

a receiver for receiving the signal, for retrieving the numbering information from the signal, and for numbering services of the plurality of services in dependence on the number information, wherein the transport streams include network information tables, and wherein each network information table comprises a first descriptor providing information to the receiver on performing an automatic service update, a linkage descriptor indicating a move of a service to another network, and a second descriptor indicating the numbering information, and wherein the receiver is configured to renumber the moved service in accordance with information in the second descriptor.

Wasilewski does not teach the elements of claim 1 as described above and does not individually render claim 1 obvious.

Kishtaka was cited by the examiner as teaching a Network Information Table. Kishtaka discloses a Network Information Table that is transmitted, in addition to the data corresponding to a program that includes a service list descriptor. However, Kishtaka fails to disclose that the Network Information Table provides an indication of a move of a service to another network and does not teach, suggest or describe the elements of claim 1 as described above, and so does not individually render claim 1 obvious.

As indicated by the examiner, both Wasilewski and Kishtaka fail to disclose that the Network Information Table provides an indication of a move of a service to

another network and does not teach, suggest or describe the elements of claim 1 as described above.

Suga was cited by the examiner as teaching adding a new service option to a user, such as a fast-forwardable service, which has “moved” to the network available to the user. What Suga teaches is detecting a new broadcast program, storing the program and reproducing the program at a speed faster than the normal speed. Suga also teaches linking an existing service to a corresponding fast-forward version of the same program broadcast at a high transmission speed on another service. Information regarding the stored location of a program is added to program specific information (PSI) at some arbitrary part. The PSI is specific to a particular program. However, there is no indication that that a new service has “moved” to the network available to the user. Furthermore, there is no suggestion of the elements of claim 1, a “receiver is configured to renumber the moved service in accordance with information in the second descriptor.”

Further, nothing in the combination of Wasilewski, Kishtaka and Suga would suggest the elements of claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable over Wasilewski, Kishtaka, and Suga references whether taken alone or in any combination with the other. Claims 2-6 are patentable over Wasilewski, Kishtaka and Suga at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 1.

**Applicant: Frederik Bleker**  
**Application No.: 10/574,366**

For the reasons presented above, withdrawal of the 35 USC § 103 rejection of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1-6, are in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Frederik Bleker

By /Thomas A. Mattioli/  
Thomas A. Mattioli  
Registration No. 56,773

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.  
United Plaza  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4009  
Telephone: (215) 568-6400  
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

TAM/MDD/jmn